

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria. Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FI	LING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/815,670	03/23/2001		Hiroshi Yoshida	09792909-4825	5768
26263	7590	07/14/2004		EXAMINER	
SONNENS	CHEIN 1	NATH & ROSENT	LEUNG, QUYEN PHAN		
P.O. BOX 0		ATION SEADS TO	WED.	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WACKER DRIVE STATION, SEARS TOWER CHICAGO, IL 60606-1080				2828	

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

in the state of th	Application No.	Applicant(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Advisory Action	09/815,670	YOSHIDA ET AL.	YOSHIDA ET AL.	
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Quyen P. Leung	2828		
The MAILING DATE of this communication	appears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspondence addre	ess	
THE REPLY FILED 24 June 2004 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114	to avoid abandonment of this er: (1) a timely filed amendment opeal (with appeal fee); or (3)	application. A proper reply nt which places the application	to a on in	
PERIOD FOI	R REPLY [check either a) or t	o)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailin b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of no event, however, will the statutory period for reply exponents on the control of the period of the p	if this Advisory Action, or (2) the date xpire later than SIX MONTHS from the WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTH. The date on which the petition underiod of extension and the correspondate of the shortened statutory period e Office later than three months after	he mailing date of the final rejection HS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. S er 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the approp ding amount of the fee. The approp for reply originally set in the final O	n. See MPEP priate extension priate extension office action; or	
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appell 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37		•		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered	ed because:			
(a) X they raise new issues that would require f	urther consideration and/or se	earch (see NOTE below);		
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see No	ote below);			
(c) they are not deemed to place the applicat issues for appeal; and/or	ion in better form for appeal b	y materially reducing or sim	plifying the	
(d) they present additional claims without ca	nceling a corresponding num	ber of finally rejected claims.	•	
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.				
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following re	ejection(s):	<i>,</i>		
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) w canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ould be allowable if submitted	I in a separate, timely filed a	mendment	
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request application in condition for allowance because		n considered but does NOT	place the	
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	because it is not directed SC	LELY to issues which were	newly	
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendr explanation of how the new or amended claim			id an	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	ows:			
Claim(s) allowed:				
Claim(s) objected to:			•	
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,5,6,8,9,13,14,16,17,21,22 a</u>	nd 24-30.			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	·			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a)	approved or b) disapprov	ed by the Examiner.		
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure State	ement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper N	lo(s)		

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

10. Other: ____

Quyen P. Leung Primary Examiner Art Unit: 2828 Continuation of 2. NOTE: Proposed amendment feature of "combined thickness of less than or equal tof 0.2 um but greater than zero" is not supported by the specification as originally filed. Further, claim 26 as proprosed does not overcome the applied prior art .